

PATENT

C. REMARKS**1. Summary**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-16 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, and 14 were rejected in the previous Office Action and claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16 were objected to but were otherwise deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended in this response. No claims have been cancelled or added in this response. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

2. Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' patent agent, Scott Schmok, and the Examiner on May 3, 2004. During the telephonic interview, Applicants' patent agent and the Examiner discussed differences between Applicants' claimed invention and the cited prior art reference (U.S. Patent Number 5,579,480 to Cidon et al., hereinafter "Cidon"). Applicants' patent agent explained that Applicants claim using two labels whereby a first label is used to identify a cell's routing location and a second label is used to identify a cell's source location. The Examiner stated that Cidon teaches using a single label and, depending upon whether a cell is traversing in a forward direction or a reverse direction, the label includes information that corresponds to a cell's routing location or a cell's source location. The Examiner suggested that claim 1 would clearly read over the cited art if Applicants amended claim 1 to distinctly claim that

Docket NoSZ9-97-009N

Page 8 of 11
Droz et al. - 09/463,002

Atty Ref. No. IBM-R326

PATENT

both labels are concurrently swapped. Applicants have incorporated such amendment in this response.

3. Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,579,480 to Cidon et al. (hereinafter "Cidon"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The limitations set forth in Applicants' amended claim 1 include:

the sending nodes include a first label into each of the cells representing an identification of the routing of the cell;

the sending nodes include a second label into each of the cells representing an identification of the source of the cell;

the forwarding node concurrently swaps both the first label associated with a forward direction and the second label associated with a backward direction using the swapping table.

Applicants claim swapping a first label and a second label, each of which are used for different purposes. The first label identifies a cell's routing location and the second label identifies a cell's source location. As discussed above and as suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the third element of claim 1 in order distinctly claim that both labels are concurrently swapped at a forwarding node.

In contrast, Cidon teaches using a single label and, depending whether a cell is traversing in a forward direction or

PATENT

a reverse direction, the label includes information that corresponds to a cell's routing location or a cell's source location. Specifically, Cidon states "for forward VC traversal, the VC/VP traversal label 174 contains the output VCI of the corresponding VC at the node that is sending the VC traversal message. For reverse VC traversal, the VC/VP traversal label 174 contains the input VC label for the VC that is being traversed in reverse" (col. 8: lines 61-65, emphasis added). Cidon does not teach using two labels and, therefore, does not teach or suggest "concurrently swap[ing] both the first label associated with a forward direction and the second label associated with a backward direction" as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, Applicants have overcome the Office Action's rejection of claim 1, and amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 4 are each dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 6 as amended is an apparatus claim that includes the same limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 7 and 9 each depend upon claim 6 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim 11 as amended includes the same limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 12 and 14 are dependent upon claim 11 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

PATENT

4. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16 were objected to as depending upon rejected claims but were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form. As set forth above in Section 3, Applicants have amended the independent claims from which these claims depend overcoming the rejections of the independent claims. Notwithstanding the fact that each of these claims is independently allowable, as indicated in the Office Action, each of these claims is also allowable because each depends, directly or indirectly, on an allowable independent claim. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Objection to claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the claims presented in this amendment corresponding to the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,383
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742

Docket NoSZ9-97-009N

Page 11 of 11
Droz et al. - 09/463,002

Atty Ref. No. IBM-R326